



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/703,160	10/31/2000	Michael Jay King	CITI0197	9748

75127 7590 01/10/2008
KING & SPALDING LLP (CITI CUSTOMER NUMBER)
ATTN: GEORGE T. MARCOU
1700 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, NW
SUITE 200
WASHINGTON, DC 20006

EXAMINER

KENDALL, CHUCK O

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2192

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

01/10/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/703,160

Applicant(s)

KING, MICHAEL JAY

Examiner

Chuck O. Kendall

Art Unit

2192

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 October 2000.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-75 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 75 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18, 22-24, 26-28, 38-55, 59-62 and 64 - 65 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) 19-21, 25, 29-37, 56-58, 63 and 66-74 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 13 October 2000 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 6/29/05
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

Detailed Action

1. This action is in response to Application filed 10/13/00.
2. Claims 1 – 75 have been examined.

Claim objections

3. Claims 1 – 75 are being objected for not properly defining the acronym (XFS) within the claimed limitations. The term XFS should be defined at least once within the claim body in order to separate it from other acronyms of same form.

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the “right to exclude” granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422

F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1 and 75 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1 – 31 of U.S. Patent No. 6,968,321 B1. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because,

claims 1 and 75 of 09/703160 which discloses an XFS terminal for receiving data, issuing requests and translating and obtaining request made by the XFS is an obvious variation of Yu's patent 6,968, 321 in claim 1, which also in a more detailed embodiment discloses receiving the remote operator's selection of at least one of the self-service financial transaction terminal operator functions (same as receiving data by a self service terminal application as claimed in '160) by the self-service financial transaction terminal from the remote operator interface client computing device, Yu's

patent also shows interfacing between the client and the operator and providing the operator with the selections, which is the same as translating the request between the terminal and the provider.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

5. Claims 1 – 18, 22 – 24, 26 – 28, 38 – 55, 59 – 62, and 64 – 65 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Krawiec et al. US 7,051,096 B1.

Regarding claims 1 and 38, a method for obtaining at least one device service on a self-service transaction terminal using a service provider framework, comprising:

receiving data by a self-service transaction terminal application indicative of a need for obtaining a transaction terminal device service (4:15 – 25);

issuing a request by the transaction terminal application to an XFS manager to get the transaction terminal device service (4:10 – 15, see WOSA/XFS);

translating the request by the XFS manager for processing by a service provider; and (4:24 - 30, see process requested service)

obtaining the transaction terminal device service by the service provider (4:25 – 5).

Regarding claims 2 and 39, the method of claim 1, wherein receiving the data by the transaction terminal application further comprises receiving the data indicative of the need for obtaining the transaction terminal device service in connection with a device selected from a group of transaction terminal devices consisting of a depository, a printer, a card reader, a safe door, a cash dispenser, and a touch screen (2:13 – 20 and 4:30 – 35).

Regarding claims 3 and 40, the method of claim 1, wherein issuing the request to the XFS manager further comprises making a sub-routine call by the transaction terminal application to the XFS manager to get the transaction terminal device service from a service provider (3:60 – 67).

Regarding claims 4 and 41, the method of claim 1, wherein translating the request for processing by the service provider further comprises translating a sub-routine call by the XFS manager as an entry point into the service provider for processing by the service provider (5:23 – 25, see service mode entry).

Regarding claims 5 and 42, the method of claim 4, wherein translating the sub-routine call as an entry point into the service provider further comprises instantiating a request object associated with the request (4:27 – 37).

Regarding claims 6 and 43, the method of claim 1, wherein translating the request for processing by the service provider further comprises implementing the service provider (5:23 – 25, see service mode entry).

Regarding claims 7 and 44, the method of claim 6, wherein implementing the service provider further comprises instantiating an instance of a service provider framework XFS service provider base class and at least one instance of a service provider framework request object required to process the request (4:10 – 20).

Regarding claims 8 and 45, the method of claim 7, wherein instantiating the instance of the service provider framework XFS service provider base class and service provider framework request object further comprises instantiating a specific instance of the service provider's service provider request object derived from an XFS service provider base class service provider request object class hierarchy (4:10 – 20).

Regarding claims 9 and 46, the method of claim 7, wherein instantiating the instance of the service provider framework XFS service provider base class and service provider framework request object further comprises instantiating the instance of the service provider framework XFS service provider base class and at least one instance of the service provider framework request object defined for a request class selected from a plurality of request classes derived from one another (4:13 – 26).

Regarding claims 10 and 47, the method of claim 7, wherein instantiating the instance of the service provider framework XFS service provider base class and framework request object further comprises instantiating the instance of the service provider framework XFS service provider base class and at least one instance of the framework request object defined for a request class selected from a group of request classes consisting of a SpiRequest class, a SpiAsyncRequest class, a request specific class, and a service provider specific request class (4:13 – 26).

Regarding claims 11 and 48, the method of claim 1, wherein obtaining the transaction terminal device service by the service provider further comprises invoking at least one virtual method within a derived object of the service provider by the service provider framework through class inheritance to allow the service provider to perform processing unique to the transaction terminal device service (13:55-65, see ocx method).

Regarding claims 12 and 49, the method of claim 1, wherein obtaining the transaction terminal device service by the service provider further comprises processing the request in at least one of an immediate processing part and a deferred processing part (24:45 – 15:13).

Regarding claims 13 and 50, the method of claim 12, wherein processing the request in the immediate processing part further comprises performing immediate processing in a thread used by the XFS manager when invoking an entry point of the service provider (4:13 – 26).

Regarding claims 14 and 51, the method of claim 12, wherein processing the request in the immediate processing part further comprises performing parameter verification by a service provider framework in an immediate processing method of the service provider framework (12:40 – 50).

Regarding claims 15 and 52, the method of claim 12, wherein processing the request in the immediate processing part further comprises invoking a `spImmediateProcessing ()` method within the service provider's derived class by the service provider framework (13:55 -14:25).

Regarding claims 16 and 53, the method of claim 15, wherein invoking the `splImmediateProcessing()` method within the service provider's derived class further comprises returning a return code from `splImmediateProcessing ()` to the XFS manager (4:13 – 5:35).

Regarding claims 17 and 54, the method of claim 12, wherein processing the request in the immediate processing part further comprises determining a code by a service provider framework for return to the XFS manager (4:13 – 5:35).

Regarding claims 18 and 55, the method of claim 12, wherein processing the request in the immediate processing part further comprises processing at least one of a `WFPCancelAsyncRequest` request, a `WFPSetTraceLevel` request, and a `WFPUnload` request as a process immediate request by a service provider framework (4:13 – 6:35).

Regarding claims 22 and 59, the method of claim 12, wherein processing the request in the deferred processing part further comprises performing deferred processing for the request that is common to all service providers by a service provider framework (4:10 – 20).

Regarding claims 23 and 60, the method of claim 12, wherein processing the request in the deferred processing part further comprises invoking a `spDeferredProcessing()` method within a derived class of the service provider by a service provider framework (4:10 – 20).

Regarding claims 24 and 61, the method of claim 23, wherein processing the request in the deferred processing part further comprises performing all processing

necessary to satisfy 15 the request within the spDeferredProcessing method by the service provider (13:55 -14:25).

Regarding claims 25 and 62, the method of claim 24, wherein processing the request in the deferred processing part further comprises posting a request complete event by the service provider (16:5 – 22).

Regarding claims 27, 63 and 64 the method of claim 12, wherein processing the request in the deferred processing part further comprises posting a request complete event by a service provider framework (16:5 – 22).

Regarding claims 28 and 65, the method of claim 1, wherein obtaining the device service by the service provider further comprises accessing at least one request parameter by the service provider (16:5 – 22).

Allowable Subject Matter

6. Claims 19 – 21, 25, 29 – 37, 56 – 58, and 63, 66 – 74 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

“...the method of claim 12, wherein processing the request in the deferred processing part further comprises placing a request object on a deferred processing queue...”.

“... wherein processing the request in the deferred processing part further comprises terminating a thread and deleting a request object...”

"...wherein accessing the request parameter by the service provider further comprises accessing the parameter for a request selected from a group of request consisting of a WTPCancelAsyncRequest request, a WFPClose request, a WFPDeregister request, a WFPEExecute request, a WFPGetInfo request a WPFlock request, WFPOpen request, a WFPRegister request, a WFPsetTraceLevel request, WFPUnloadService request, and a WFPUnlock request..."

Reasons for allowance

7. In claim 75, the prior art of record does not teach or fairly suggest at least:

"...translating the sub-routine call at the lower level layer into a function category request by an XFS manager as an entry point into the service provider for processing by the service provider, the function request being selected from a group of function requests consisting of a WTPCancelAsyncRequest request, a WFPClose request, a WFPDeregister request, a WFPEExecute request, a WFPGetInfo request, a WPFlock request, a WFPOpen request, a WFPRegister request, a WFPSetTraceLevel request, a WFPUnloadService request, and a WFPUnlock request; and returning a result of the function category request to the application by the service provider..."

Conclusion

8. Any comments considered necessary by applicant must be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee and, to avoid processing delays, should preferably accompany the issue fee. Such submissions should be clearly labeled "Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance."

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Chuck Kendall whose telephone number is 571-272-3698. The examiner can normally be reached on 10:00 am - 6:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tuan Dam can be reached on 571-272-3695. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is **571-273-8300**.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Chuck Kendall 01/07/08